REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the above-identified Office Action. The above listing of the claims replaces all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the proposed amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 USC § 102

The rejection of claim 8 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Christie et al. (USP 5,926,482) is respectfully traversed.

In this response claim 8 is amended to call for a MTP Level 2 alignment of the link to be carried out by issuing an alignment request on the link for a given combination of parameters. If no response is received on the link, the combination of parameters are automatically changed, and a further alignment request is issued until such time as a signalling link test message is received on the link. It is further required that, upon receiving a signalling link test message on the link, the point code number are defined as a destination address in the signalling link test message and are stored in a table.

It is submitted that Christie et al. neither discloses nor suggests the automatic changing of parameters and the repeated issuance of alignment requests until such time as the a signalling link test message is received on the link.

As set forth on page 3, lines 4 – 15, of the originally filed specification, the above procedure overcomes the problems associated with installation and/or dynamic configuration of a SS7 point code device, and allows it to operate with no or minimum human configuration.

Support for the amendments to claim 8 is found in the originally filed specification and drawing – see page 4, line 20 – page 5, line 18, for example.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)

The rejection of claims 1-3 under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Christie et al. in view of Longfield et al. is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to call for a process for updating a table of distant point codes, in a point code connected to a signalling system 7 network through at least one MTP Level 3 aligned link. This process comprises listening to point code status

messages originating from distant point codes forwarded on the link, wherein the point codes are identified by point code numbers, and wherein an alignment request is issued on the link for a given combination of parameters. If no response to the alignment request is received on the link, the combination of parameters is changed and a further alignment request is reissued until a message originating from a distant point code is received. Upon receiving the message originating from a distant point code, the table is updated with the point code number of the distant point code.

It is submitted that claim 1, accordingly defines a combination of features which is neither disclosed nor suggested by the either of the references cited in this rejection when taken alone or in combination. Support for the amendment to claim 1 is found is found in the originally filed specification and drawing. Again see page 4, line 20 – page 5, line 18, by way of example.

Conclusion

It is submitted that subject matter of claims 1-3 and 8 is patentable over the art for at least the reasons advanced above. It is respectfully requested that the amendments to both claims 1 and 8 be entered and considered inasmuch as they have been lifted from claims indicated as being allowable and are such as to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-3 and 8 along with those which stand allowed, is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Jan. 05 2006   By

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Customer No.: 022879

William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874

Keith J. Townsend
Registration No. 40,358